



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

205
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,185	01/14/2000	FRANCISCO CORELLA	10991054-1	8069
22879	7590	03/29/2004	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2134	11	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/483,185	CORELLA, FRANCISCO
	Examiner Christopher J. Brown	Art Unit 2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.10.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 11 paragraph 1, filed 12/22/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, and 13 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hsu US Patent 5,982,898.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Lipner does not disclose a directory for storing authorization information. As Lipner has been overcome, the argument is moot with regards to Lipner. However with regard to other references, it is widely known that computers store information in directories, so that any authorization information cited in a reference would be taken from a directory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Hsu US 5,982,898. As per claims 1, and 13, Chapman discloses a certificate authority issuing a long-term public key identity certificate (certificate) that binds a public key of the user to long term

Art Unit: 2134

identification information (identifying information) related to the user, (Col 7 lines 57-67).

Chapman does not disclose a short-term public key certificate.

Hsu discloses a certificate authority for issuing a short term public key credential certificate (certificates that are short lived), (Col 4 line 64-Col 5 line 5 17-22). The certificate binds the public key of the user to long term identification information (name, CA signature) and to short term authorization information (expiration time, authorization code), (Col 5 lines 1-10). The user presents this short term certificate to an application (server) for authorization, (Col 5 lines 14-22). The client demonstrates knowledge of a private key corresponding to the public key in the certificate, (Col 6 line 61 - Col 7 line 3)

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's PKI system with a short term certificate of Hsu to eliminate the need of a Certificate Revocation list in order to reduce network traffic, (Hsu Col 7 lines 11-13).

As per claims 2, and 14, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Hsu discloses that the certificate has a time stamp (expiration date), (Col 5 lines 23).

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's pki system with a timestamp of Hsu to state time of validity and increase security.

As per claim 3, and 15 Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Hsu discloses that the expiration date is sufficiently short (limited amount of time), (Col 5 line 17-23).

Art Unit: 2134

As per claims 5, and 17, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Hsu discloses no methods of revocation, (Col 7 line 11).

As per claims 6, and 18, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Hsu discloses a short term certificate in a non structured form, (Fig 3).

As per claims 8, and 20, Chapman discloses using a X.509 certificate, (Col 8 lines 33-43). Chapman does not disclose a shot term certificate.

Hsu discloses a short term certificate, (Col 5 line 17).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapman's x.509 with Hsu's short term certificate, because the 509 format is supported by a number of different protocols, (Chapman Col 8 line 43), and the short term certificate need not be checked by CRLs.

As per claims 10, and 22, Chapman discloses memory, (Col 9 line 2). The long term certificate must be stored in the directory to be retrieved.

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Hsu US 5,982,898 in view of Asay US 5,903,882.

3. As per claims 4, and 16, Chapman-Hsu discloses a short term certificates with limited validity.

Asay discloses that a certificate that becomes invalid by age need not be on the schedule thus becomes invalid before the next scheduled CRL check, (Col 3 lines 1-4).

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's PKI system with Asay's CRL to enable reduced network traffic.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Hsu US 5,982,898 in view of Howell US 5,276,901.

4. As per claims 7, and 19, Chapman-Hsu discloses a short term certificate. Chapman-Hsu does not disclose a structured certificate.

Howell discloses a certificate with access restricted folders contained therein (Col 5 lines 23-30).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapman-Hsu with Howell's restricted access to increase security.

As per claims 9, and 21, Chapman-Hsu discloses using a short term X.509 certificate, (Chapman Col 8 lines 33-43).

Howell discloses restricted folders, (Col 5 line 23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapmans x.509 with Howell's restricted folders, because the 509 format is supported by a number of different protocols, (Col 8 line 43), and the restricted folders add a measure of security.

Claims 11, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Hsu US 5,982,898 in view of Maruyama US 6,393,563.

5. As per claims 11, and 23 Chapman-Hsu does not disclose a smart card.

Maruyama disclose a private key may be stored on a smartcard, (Col 1 line 20, 53-56).

It would be obvious to modify the Chapman-Hsu combination with Maruyama's smart card, because the smart card increases the security of key storage.

Claims 12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Hsu US 5,982,898 in view of Kausik US 6,263,446.

6. As per claims 12, and 24, Chapman-Hsu does not disclose a software wallet.

Kausik discloses storing a private key in a software wallet, (Col 4 lines 1-6).

It would be obvious to modify the Chapman-Hsu combination with Kausik's software wallet because the wallet increases the security of key storage.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-8023. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown



Matthew Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137